UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.3335
10 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THREE THOUSAND
THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 10 February 1994, at 6 p.m.

President:	Mr. OLHAYE	(Djibouti)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. CARDENAS
	Brazil	Mr. SARDENBERG
	China	Mr. CHEN Jian
	Czech Republic	Mr. SPORYS
	France	Mr. MERIMEE
	New Zealand	Mr. van BOHEMEN
	Nigeria	Mr. GAMBARI
	Oman	Mr. AL-KHUSSAIBY
	Pakistan	Mr. NIAZ
	Russian Federation	Mr. VORONTSOV
	Rwanda	Mr. BIZIMANA
	Spain	Mr. YAÑEZ BARNUEVO
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mr. GREY

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

94-85161 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 6 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN ANGOLA

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS ANGOLA VERIFICATION MISSION II (UNAVEM II) (S/1994/100)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Angola, in which she requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Ms. Coelho Da Cruz (Angola) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II), contained in document S/1994/100.

(The President)

Following consultations among members of the Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council has considered the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II) (S/1994/100) submitted pursuant to resolution 890 (1993) of 15 December 1993.

"The Council commends the Secretary-General, his Special Representative and the Chief Military Observer on their efforts to bring to a successful conclusion the talks between the Government of Angola and UNITA, currently taking place in Lusaka, with a view to reaching an effective and sustainable settlement of the conflict, within the framework of the "Acordos de Paz" and the relevant resolutions of the Security Council. The Council also commends the efforts of the three observer States to the Angolan peace process and those of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and of neighbouring States in support of the Lusaka talks, and encourages them to continue these efforts.

"The Council notes the progress made to date in the Lusaka talks, in particular the adoption of the general and specific principles, as well as the modalities, relating to all the military and police issues on the agenda. The Council calls upon the parties to renew their commitment to a peaceful settlement. It demands that they redouble their efforts in the Lusaka talks, with the aim of urgently attaining an effective and sustainable cease-fire and completing work on the remaining points on the agenda and concluding a peaceful settlement without procrastination.

(The President)

"The Council is deeply concerned at the intensification of hostilities and, in particular, at the recent outbreak of serious military activity at several locations in Angola, particularly at Kuito-Bie. It deplores the great loss of life and destruction of property.

"The Council stresses that the only way to achieve an effective, verifiable and sustainable cease-fire is for the parties to conclude and sign a comprehensive peace agreement. It calls upon them to honour the commitments they have already voluntarily agreed to in Lusaka, to exercise maximum restraint, to stop immediately all offensive military actions, and to commit themselves to the urgent conclusion of the Lusaka talks.

"The Council welcomes the improvement in the delivery of humanitarian relief assistance to the affected population in Angola, while acknowledging that the overall situation remains serious. It urges the parties to continue to cooperate with the United Nations agencies and the non-governmental organizations in ensuring the unimpeded delivery of humanitarian relief supplies and the necessary security for its efficient distribution. It calls upon the international community to contribute generously to humanitarian aid efforts in Angola.

"The Security Council requests the Secretary-General to keep it informed on a timely basis of developments in the Lusaka peace talks. It reaffirms its readiness to consider

(The President)

promptly any recommendations from the Secretary-General once an agreement has been concluded between the parties. It also reaffirms its readiness to consider further action in accordance with its previous resolutions.

"The Council will remain seized of the matter".

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/1994/7.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.3336
14 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THREE THOUSAND
THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 14 February 1994, at 10.30 a.m.

President:	Mr. OLHAYE	(Djibouti)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. CARDENAS
	Brazil	Mr. SARDENBERG
	China	Mr. CHEN Jian
	Czech Republic	Mr. KOVANDA
	France	Mr. MERIMEE
	New Zealand	Mr. KEATING
	Nigeria	Mr. GAMBARI
	Oman	Mr. AL-KHUSSAIBY
	Pakistan	Mr. KHAN
	Russian Federation	Mr. VORONTSOV
	Rwanda	Mr. BIZIMANA
	Spain	Mr. YAÑEZ BARNUEVO
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mrs. ALBRIGHT

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

94-85173 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

LETTER DATED 5 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/1994/124)

LETTER DATED 8 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF PAKISTAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/1994/135)

LETTER DATED 10 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/1994/152)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovenia, the Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Arab Emirates, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sacirbey (Bosnia and Herzegovina) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Farhadi (Afghanistan), Mr. Repishti (Albania), Mr. Lamamra (Algeria), Mr. Sucharipa (Austria), Mr. Aliyev (Azerbaijan), Mr. Rahman (Bangladesh), Mr. Noterdaeme (Belgium), Mrs. Frechette (Canada), Mr. Rey (Colombia), Mr. Drobnjak (Croatia), Mr. Haakonsen (Denmark), Mr. Elaraby (Egypt), Mr. Breitenstein (Finland), Mr. Zu Rantzau (Germany), Mr. Soegarda (Indonesia), Mr. Kharrazi (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Hayes (Ireland), Mr. Fulci (Italy), Mr. Hatano (Japan), Mr. Bataineh (Jordan), Mr. Wolzfeld (Luxembourg), Mr. Razali (Malaysia), Mr. Snoussi (Morocco), Mr. Biegman (Netherlands), Mr. Huslid (Norway), Mr. Catarino (Portugal), Mr. Allagany (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Cissé (Senegal), Mr. Türk (Slovenia), Mr. Yassin (Sudan), Mr. Osvald (Sweden), Mr. Abdellah (Tunisia), Mr. Batu (Turkey), Mr. Khandogy (Ukraine) and Mr. Samhan (United Arab Emirates) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I have received a request dated 11 February 1994 from Ambassador Dragomir Djokić to address the Council. With the consent of the Council, I propose to invite him to address the Council in the course of the discussion of the item before it.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in response to the requests contained in the following letters: letter dated 5 February 1994 from the Prime Minister of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitted by

(The President)

a letter of the same date from the Deputy Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council and contained in document S/1994/124; letter dated 8 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed, on behalf of the members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference Contact Group on Bosnia and Herzegovina, to the President of the Security Council, document S/1994/135; and letter dated 10 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations, addressed to the President of the Security Council, document S/1994/152.

Members of the Council also have before them letters dated 6 and 11 February 1994, respectively, from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, documents S/1994/131 and S/1994/159.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following other documents: S/1994/123, S/1994/134 and S/1994/142, letters dated 4, 8 and 9 February 1994, respectively, from the Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/1994/126, letter dated 7 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/1994/127, letter dated 6 February 1994 from the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Yugoslavia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/1994/129, letter dated 7 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Slovenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/1994/136, letter dated

(The President)

8 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/1994/137, letter dated 7 February 1994 from the Permanent Representatives of France, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/1994/138, letter dated 7 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/1994/139, letter dated 8 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/1994/143, letter dated 9 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/1994/144, letter dated 9 February 1994 from the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/1994/145, letter dated 7 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Algeria to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/1994/146, letter dated 9 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/1994/148, note verbale dated 5 February 1994 from the Permanent Mission of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/1994/153, letter dated 10 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Lithuania to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/1994/158, letter dated 10 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; and S/1994/166, letter dated 11 February 1994 from the Chargé

(The President)

d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Yugoslavia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

The first speaker is the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina, on whom I now call.

Mr. SACIRBEY (Bosnia and Herzegovina): At the outset, Mr. President, let me commend you for the able fashion in which you have directed the activities of the Security Council, and for the attention that you have given to the matter in hand. Let me at the same time direct my compliments to the Permanent Representative of the Czech Republic for the fashion in which he directed the Council during the month of January.

The terrorist attack on Sarajevo's market-place last weekend shocked and awakened the world by its brutality and carnage. For the last 22 months, though, the citizens of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina have been traumatized on a daily basis by this form of terrorism. The lack of response to such atrocities had forced the people of Bosnia to become resigned to their abandonment by the Western Powers.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization's ultimatum to the Serbian forces besieging Sarajevo is most welcome, and overdue. However, it is fair to note that the massacre of innocent civilians in the market-place was unique only in its death toll and in the media coverage it has received. Bosnian civilians have been targets of Serbian gunners on a daily basis; they have often been struck by gunfire as they struggle to gather the essentials of life or as they venture out of their homes and cellars seeking to overcome the psychological depression of the siege.

Just the day before the market-place massacre, nine Sarajevo civilians were murdered and almost 20 were maimed while waiting in line at a United Nations relief centre. Three weeks ago a group of children were murdered while seeking to recapture their youth by sledging on the snow. Six of them found death as their only escape from the horrors of Sarajevo. Their surviving friends will have to

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

live with physical and emotional scars because of their attempts to recapture childhood fantasy.

A couple of months ago 15 Sarajevans were targeted and murdered while playing soccer. It is impossible to recount all the other incidents in which one or two or three innocent Sarajevans happened to be the lonely, and therefore the forgotten, victims of Serbian gunners targeting civilians for random terrorism.

In each previous instance the United Nations forces concluded that the Serbian forces were responsible for the atrocities. Each instance symbolizes the ongoing siege and strangulation of Sarajevo. Each of these terrorist acts should have triggered the Western and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) commitment to stop the strangulation of Sarajevo, not to mention the obligation to protect the safe areas, as required by Security Council resolutions 824 (1993) and 836 (1993).

Of course, the plight of the other five "safe areas" in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as that of the remainder of the country, continues, at the same level of deprivation and suffering. The Muslim and Croat citizens of Banja Luka are being exposed to Nazi-style repression and physical torture. Recently six civilians were murdered, without any provocation, by the Serbian military police in Banja Luka. No legal recourse has been pursued by the Serbian occupation authorities with respect to this crime.

The citizens of the safe area of Bihac have been exposed to a week of an intensified Serbian onslaught and shelling. Civilians are once again the targets. Bihac city hospital has been shelled consistently; in the last few days it has been hit directly eight times, killing 14 patients and causing enormous damage to the

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

facility. This attack was timed to coincide with the world's focus on Sarajevo, but the consequences have been just as deadly as the terrorist attack on Sarajevo's market-place.

Late is better than never and a little is preferable to nothing when human lives are directly at stake. Let me, therefore, thank NATO for its most recent effort, and in particular for the leadership shown by its Secretary-General, Manfred Woerner. Let me also acknowledge the efforts of all those contributing to the humanitarian relief, including the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), in our country.

We recognize the potential risk that these new steps may pose for all, but we are certain that a failure of will to change the deteriorating status quo would result in even greater danger for Bosnian civilians, in no progress towards peace and in disaster for all. The new path that we have hopefully and finally taken is the only logical first step towards peace. For those who understand only the language of force and the logic of war, this step will be the first to counter their aggression and terrorism.

For us, who understand the logic of peace, this will provide the necessary credibility and confidence to establish a more suitable environment for the creation of peace. This first step cannot just be labelled as the logic of war or the logic of peace; it is the only logical step.

We commend the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, for initiating this first step and the commitment by NATO. Resolutions 824 (1993) and 836 (1993) do not require any further action or consultation by the Security Council if the terms of those resolutions and the ultimatum are not met by the Serbians.

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

The conditions of resolutions 824 (1993) and 836 (1993) and the withdrawal of the Serbian forces and their weapons should be executed fully and in a timely manner. Any deviation should trigger the necessary response, to which there is already a commitment.

The Secretary-General and NATO have been delegated with this responsibility, and the international community and Member States expect that these delegated obligations and commitments will be carried out without equivocation.

The Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is, under resolutions 824 (1993) and 836 (1993), explicitly allowed to retain its forces and weapons within the "safe areas", including Sarajevo. None the less, as a commitment of good will, we have also agreed to withdraw or to deliver our heavy weaponry to United Nations control. Our good will here certainly heightens the obligation of NATO and the international community to be true to the letter of their commitment, since our citizens may become even more defenceless and exposed to any Serbian full or partial non-compliance. Any inclination to avoid taking the current first step under the terms of resolutions 824 (1993) and 836 (1993) would not be constructive.

Although we are prepared to consider United Nations demilitarization and administration of Sarajevo as part of a final and overall peace plan, such premature attempts can only delay the taking of the necessary steps and deviate from the desired conclusion. In fact, any inclination to overlook what may be seen as partial or even minimal Serbian non-compliance would be most dangerous for our citizens, for NATO's credibility, for the efforts

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

of the United Nations in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and for overall peace in the region.

The siege of Sarajevo should be completely lifted, and movement into the city should be free of any Serbian control and interference.

The Bosnians are continuing their commitment and efforts towards negotiations. We are making very painful concessions. We even continue to sit across the table from those who are responsible for the market-place massacre and other terrorist acts.

The Western Powers have chosen this two-way track to a negotiated settlement. Ultimately, we may all have to pay the price for negotiating with and legitimizing terrorists and fascists. None the less, we have no option but to follow the lead of the most powerful, those who are, presumably, the defenders of democracy, freedom and tolerance.

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

But I remind all not to forget the second track. The proper response to a terrorist act is the use of force and not a call for more negotiations. To state or even imply that a terrorist act exhibits an even greater reason for negotiations is to give political and diplomatic weight to that very act. Members of the Council: keep your end of the bargain, your pledge to the proper response, and we will remain committed to the difficult negotiating track.

In this context, we encourage the Security Council and the Secretary-General to ensure that the negotiations are not subject to the so-called realities of the Serbian aggression and conquest - the realities of war and genocide - and that peace is achieved on the basis of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and the United Nations Charter. Most notably, "ethnic cleansing" should be reversed, and the acquisition of territory and the changing of borders by force or genocide should be rejected.

We will support any efforts to broaden the involvement of the Security Council and Member States in the peace process, and in this context we back the relocation of talks, even intermittently, to New York City.

Regardless of the negotiating track, the terrorist attack on the marketplace in Sarajevo once again underscores the need to bring war criminals at all levels to justice. Justice should not be sacrificed for political expediency. Otherwise, we may truly sacrifice any chance for a real and durable peace.

The plight of Sarajevo is only the tip of the iceberg of the suffering and the aggression directed against the Bosnian people. If peace is to be secured and the credibility of the negotiating

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

process is to be established, the international community must move to implement Security Council resolutions 824 (1993) and 836 (1993) in the other five safe areas and to take the necessary measures to secure the safety of all Bosnians throughout our country, or at least to allow us to defend ourselves unhindered.

It is clear to us that the arms embargo imposed by resolution 713 (1991) does not apply to the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We are a country under attack from a much better-armed aggressor bent on territorial conquest and genocide. It is clear that the aggression continues and that the Council still has not fully confronted the aggressor. Our rights under Article 51 of the Charter are clear and absolute.

The Council's commitment to ensure full and timely compliance with resolutions 824 (1993) and 836 (1993) around Sarajevo and to extend this commitment to the other safe areas and the remainder of Bosnia and Herzegovina will be critical in determining the necessity for us to exercise our full rights under Article 51.

Finally, let me quote Mr. Anthony Lewis, the syndicated columnist, who has so extensively analysed and commented on the aggression with respect to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

> "The NATO ultimatum to Serbian forces around Sarajevo could be, at long last, a first step toward ending the bloodiest aggression in Europe in 50 years. Or it could be an empty gesture by politicians trying only to escape embarrassment." (The New York Times, 11 February 1994, p. A35)

It is our sincere hope that Mr. Lewis is correct in the former rather than the latter assessment.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. MERIMEE (France) (interpretation from French): The French policy on Bosnia and Herzegovina has a clear goal: peace through a negotiated political settlement. The recent decisions of the States members of the Atlantic Alliance should be interpreted in the context of reinvigorating the search for a political solution. Their only purpose is to make available to the United Nations the means to implement Security Council decisions, and thus to improve the chances for peace.

In that perspective, our top priority is to lift the siege of Sarajevo. We want to prevent the recurrence of massacres of civilians like those of 4 and 5 February. We also want, by giving the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) control of heavy weapons, to begin the demilitarization of Sarajevo and to move towards placing the city under provisional United Nations administration as contemplated in the European Union plan of action. I would recall that this peace plan is the basis for the political solution we seek. We hope that the entire international community will be able to endorse the efforts of the European Union and that the Union's objectives can be the object of a common strategy by the international community, including - which is very important - the Russian Federation. In that connection, we welcome the positions taken by the Government of the United States.

As I have just said, we wish first of all to lift the siege of Sarajevo, and we hope we are on the right track. Let me express my Government's satisfaction at the decisions taken on 9 February by the North Atlantic Council, in response to the 6 February request by the Secretary-General addressed to Mr. Woerner that the North

(Mr. Mérimée, France)

Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), at the request of the United Nations, authorize air strikes to prevent further shelling of Sarajevo following the intolerable massacres of 4 and 5 February. The decisions of the North Atlantic Council respond also to proposals made by the United States and by France with a view to ending the siege of the city and achieving the withdrawal or supervision of the heavy weapons that represent a constant threat to the city.

What did the North Atlantic Council decide? Essentially, it is that the heavy weapons of the Bosnian Serb forces within a radius of 20 kilometres from the centre of Sarajevo shall be withdrawn or regrouped and placed under UNPROFOR control within 10 days. The North Atlantic Council also called upon the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina to place its heavy weapons within the operational area under UNPROFOR control within the same time frame. We welcome its having agreed to do so.

To ensure the implementation of these measures, the members of NATO decided that heavy weapons remaining within the operational area at the end of the stated time and not under the control of UNPROFOR would be subject - no matter which side they belonged to - to air strikes carried out in close coordination with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The members of NATO also agreed to Mr. Boutros-Ghali's request to authorize the Commander-in-Chief of Allied Forces in Southern Europe to launch air strikes against artillery positions from which attacks on civilian targets in Sarajevo originated.

I will spare the Council a lengthy exegisis and simply say that, for my Government, the North Atlantic Council decisions I

(Mr. Mérimée, France)

have just summarized are squarely within the framework of Security Council resolutions 824 (1993) and 836 (1993) with respect to safe areas. Indeed, the lifting of the siege from those areas - Sarajevo in particular - is the purpose of those resolutions, which, inter alia, authorized UNPROFOR to use force, including air power, in fulfilling its mandate. Hence, there is no need for these decisions of the North Atlantic Council to be submitted to the Security Council for any further decision. Moreover, my Government considers that in contacting NATO the Secretary-General was acting within his authority and in accordance with Security Council resolutions.

(Mr. Mérimée, France)

The measures set out in the decisions taken by the North Atlantic Council should make it possible to raise the Sarajevo siege within 10 days. My Government obviously will be very pleased at any action taken by the parties which will lead to the conclusion of a cease-fire and to the neutralization of heavy weapons on a voluntary basis within the timed allowed. In this connection, we welcome the negotiations that have begun in Sarajevo under the aegis of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the Commander of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina. My Government also takes note of the desire of the Russian Federation that the Security Council consider steps to raise the siege of Sarajevo and to place the city under United Nations administration. We are pleased to say that we share this same objective. Nevertheless, we believe that such consideration should in no way call into question the decisions of the North Atlantic Council, which should be implemented fully.

May I again make it abundantly clear that the purpose of my Government is to revive the diplomatic process and encourage the search for a negotiated political solution.

The Council will have noted that the members of NATO, by taking the decisions to which I have just referred, have been acting very clearly in pursuit of a logic of peace. We believe that there is no other way to settle the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina than through negotiations. The only lasting solution to the conflict is not military, but political, and it must be based on a peace plan acceptable to all parties. A comprehensive settlement plan now exists; it is that of the European Union. This

(Mr. Mérimée, France)

plan, which so far has not been accepted by all the parties, is once more being discussed. Its provisions are not immutable. They can be modified to allow for qualitative adjustments to make the future predominantly Muslim republic economically viable. It is important that the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina now make its demands in this connection clearly known. We are prepared to consider them and to make the necessary efforts, in conjunction with our partners and all other States concerned, to impress upon the parties the advantage for them in accepting a political settlement on that basis.

The conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina has now reached a turning-point which we should all be aware of. The time has come for us all to come out strongly in favour of peace. This is the message my Minister wished to emphasize when he visited Sarajevo at the end of last week.

Mrs. ALBRIGHT (United States): The objective of this Council, as it is of my Government, should be to encourage the parties to the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina to negotiate a real peace, a just and viable peace that is freely accepted by all. Put simply, the United States believes that this conflict should be resolved at the negotiating table, not on the battlefield. But the horror of recent days is evidence that the objective of peace cannot be obtained by diplomacy alone. Our diplomacy must be backed by a willingness to use force when that is essential in the cause of peace, for it is only force plus diplomacy that can stop the slaughter in Sarajevo and break the stalemate in Geneva.

There is a 10-day deadline for the withdrawal or placement under United Nations control of heavy weapons identified within the

(Mrs. Albright, United States)

area of exclusion. Weapons not under United Nations control may be subject to air strikes. During the 10 days the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) will also respond, in coordination with the United Nations, to the artillery or mortar fire that has wreaked such havoc in Sarajevo. These decisions are consistent with resolutions approved by this Council. They do not require further Council action. We need to remind ourselves that the decision to initiate air strikes rests in the hands of the Secretary-General, and it was the Council that put it there.

It is important for all to be clear about what the decision of the North Atlantic Council means and what it does not mean. It is not an intervention in this conflict on behalf of one or another of the parties. The purpose is to persuade the parties that the pursuit of a military conclusion to this conflict serves the interests of no one. As the Council has repeatedly stated, a negotiated peace, acceptable to all, is preferable for all. Those who understand this point will have their security enhanced by the North Atlantic Council decisions. Those who do not will, through their own aggression, put themselves at risk.

Neither NATO nor this Council can or should impose a settlement upon the parties, for an imposed settlement will not be a lasting settlement. But by seeking to reduce the level of violence around Sarajevo, a United Nations designated safe area, we hope to reinvigorate and lend substance to the negotiating process. My own Government is actively engaged in that effort.

At this point I would like to pay tribute to the representative from the Russian Federation, for as recently as last week, and as long ago as last February, his Government has advocated taking action to demilitarize Sarajevo.

(Mrs. Albright, United States)

The international community is saying to the Bosnian Serbs "You have a choice. You can live up to your avowed desire for peace by cooperating in steps that will reduce tensions and improve the climate for peace, or you can take aggressive actions and invite the bitter consequences. In making this choice you should not doubt our will, or that of our NATO partners to carry out the 9 February decision. The shelling of Sarajevo must stop, and the rights and safety of all United Nations and other international personnel, whether official or private voluntary, civilian or military, must be strictly respected." In that regard, we note that the United States will advocate strong action by this Council if the Bosnian Serbs follow through on their threats to restrict the movement of international relief workers.

To the parties in the conflict, we say "The time has come to begin building a viable future for your people. It is time for reconstruction and repair, for tilling the soil and schooling the young. We can help you build a different future, but you must do your part. For your citizens are entitled to what President Clinton called, in the context of the Middle East, the quiet miracle of a normal life. Your families deserve to be able to cross the street, to sled down a hill, to worship God and to go to the market without fearing that at any minute death may descend upon them from the sky."

As we watch the Olympics on our television screens this week, we are reminded that it was just 10 years ago that we watched the 1984 Olympics in Sarajevo. It was just 10 years ago that the world was treated to pictures of a modern, European city, of mosques standing alongside Orthodox and Catholic churches, in what was a wondrous symbol of a multi-ethnic city.

(Mrs. Albright, United States)

To my colleagues on the Council, and to the Secretary-General, the decision of the North Atlantic Council will bring closer to reality the sentiments we here in the Security Council have so often expressed concerning Bosnia: to seek an end to aggression, to safeguard innocent lives, and to encourage the peaceful resolution of disputes. In so doing, for the first time a regional security organization, NATO, has acted to implement a decision of this Council to use force under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

We are entering uncharted waters. Cooperation between NATO and the United Nations is essential, not only for the citizens of Sarajevo and other safe areas in Bosnia, but also for the precedent it will set for the future of collective security.

The firm and fair implementation of NATO's decision will contribute much to the credibility of this Council and of the United Nations, in which have been vested the most cherished aspirations of humankind.

In closing, let me also pay special tribute to the representative of France, with whom we have worked so closely in recent days, and whose Government played such a critical role in working to help the citizens of Sarajevo.

Sir David HANNAY (United Kingdom): This Council is only too conscious of the tragedy of Bosnia and above all of the tragedy of its people. In the nearly two years of war in that country, the suffering has been heart-wrenching, terrible crimes have been committed and no good, no useful purpose has been served. It is right therefore that we should hold this debate at what could prove a turning-point in the conflict, a moment when an already dreadful situation could get even worse or a moment when a corner could be turned and decisive progress be made towards a peaceful settlement.

The weekend before last some 70 civilians died in Sarajevo as a result of artillery and mortar attacks. We unreservedly condemn those who caused these deaths. There could be no more graphic demonstration of the urgency of ending this strife.

It seems clear - and this is not a value judgement but rather an analysis based on the facts - that none of the parties can achieve their aims on the battlefield. The longer the fighting goes on, the more everyone will suffer. Only a political settlement achieved at the negotiating table will bring an end to the hostilities and create conditions for a lasting peace.

This was the context within which the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), of which my country is one, met on 9 February to consider how they could best contribute towards the search by the United Nations for a political settlement. That is why NATO, acting within this logic of peace, agreed on a number of measures designed primarily to support the efforts of the United Nations.

In this respect, NATO decided, first, to agree, with immediate effect, to the United Nations Secretary-General's request of 6 February to be prepared to launch air strikes, at the request of

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

the United Nations, against artillery or mortar positions which the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) determines are responsible for attacks against civilian targets in Sarajevo.

Secondly, NATO decided to call upon all the parties to respect a cease-fire around Sarajevo. NATO called on the Bosnian Serbs to withdraw their heavy weapons from an area within 20 kilometres of the city, excluding an area within 2 kilometres of the centre of Pale, or to place their heavy weapons under UNPROFOR control within 10 days from that decision. NATO also called upon the Bosnian Government to place its heavy weapons in the same area under UNPROFOR's control within this period, and to refrain from attacks launched from within the city.

Thirdly, NATO decided that the heavy weapons of any of the parties found within this exclusion zone and not under United Nations control after 10 days from 10 February would be subject to air strikes, to be conducted in close coordination with the United Nations Secretary-General and consistent with NATO's earlier decisions of 2 and 9 August on the provision of air support in defence of UNPROFOR and in furtherance of its mandate.

My delegation participated in taking these important decisions and supports them wholeheartedly. Force should not be used unless it is genuinely necessary and it contributes towards the search for a negotiated settlement. But it is clear that the shelling of Sarajevo had to stop, and that its people had to be relieved. It is now up to the parties, and above all to the Bosnian Serbs, to take the necessary action. If they do not respond, they should be in no doubt of the action that the United Nations and NATO working together will take.

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

We welcome and support the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the United Nations Force Commander in Bosnia to secure the parties' observance of a cease-fire and the withdrawal or cantonment under United Nations control of heavy weaponry in Sarajevo. The deployments by UNPROFOR on 10 and 11 February to monitor the confrontation line are an important first step. These are valuable moves towards the wider objective of placing Sarajevo temporarily under United Nations administration, as envisaged in the European Union Action Plan. It is particularly encouraging that this objective, which must be seen as part of an overall strategy for bringing peace to Bosnia, enjoys the full support of the Russian Federation.

Looking beyond Sarajevo, UNPROFOR must be able to continue to carry out its mandate to safeguard the delivery of humanitarian aid and to deter attacks on the threatened areas. It is essential that the parties cooperate fully with UNPROFOR in ensuring that the rotation of troops in Srebrenica and the opening up of Tuzla airport to the humanitarian effort take place forthwith.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to all those involved, often at considerable personal risk, in supporting the humanitarian effort throughout Bosnia, as well as those, including Lord Owen and Mr. Stoltenberg, who are working ceaselessly for a negotiated settlement. It is shocking that many of these people continue to face dangers in carrying out their duties. The duty of the parties to cooperate fully and unconditionally with the international humanitarian effort and to observe the commitments they took upon themselves in the agreements of 18 and 29 November 1993 is clear. We for our part remain

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

committed to sustaining this aid effort as long as the security conditions allow.

In conclusion, delay and procrastination do not, in Bosnia, lead to things getting better: they lead to their getting worse. That, alas, is the story of the last two years. It is therefore crucial that the parties negotiate seriously now to find solutions to the remaining issues that separate them. The European Union Action Plan points the way towards a settlement. We warmly welcome the closest possible United States and Russian involvement in this search for peace. The international community must now work to revitalize the peace process and bring it to an early and successful conclusion.

Mr. YAÑEZ BARNUEVO (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): We are meeting today in response to the requests made by the representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Pakistan - on behalf of the Organization of the Islamic Conference - and the Russian Federation to consider events that have stirred public opinion throughout the world: the recent bombardments which once again have devastated the city of Sarajevo, causing a high number of civilian victims.

Our response must be clear and unanimous. The international community cannot allow such acts to continue.

The European Union, at the ministerial meeting of 7 February, vigorously condemned the merciless bombardments of the civilian population of Sarajevo and, in agreement with the United Nations Secretary-General, has made the immediate lifting of the siege of Sarajevo a priority objective, using, to this effect, all necessary means, including recourse to air strikes.

(Mr. Yañez Barnuevo, Spain)

We unconditionally condemn the perpetrators of these brutal acts. It is true that, thus far it has not been possible to determine who was responsible for the bombardment on the market, despite the investigations carried out by the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) and the establishment of an ad hoc commission of investigation. Nevertheless, we cannot overlook the fact that this tragedy took place after many months during which Sarajevo had been subjected to continuous bombardments from Serbian positions, with many civilian victims, not to speak of the immeasurable damage to the historical and cultural heritage of the capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina, whose unique character as a multicultural, multi-ethnic and multireligious centre must be preserved from destruction, as Security Council resolutions 824 (1993) and 859 (1993) point out.

If the Bosnian Serbs do not want to be the object of the condemnation of the international community, which their conduct has earned, they need but silence their artillery and withdraw them or place them under the control of UNPROFOR, as has been demanded of them at least since the London Conference in August 1992.

This situation could not continue, or remain without a response. Therefore, we are pleased by the rapid initiative taken by the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, in addressing a letter to his counterpart at the Atlantic Alliance, Mr. Manfred Wörner, on 6 February. His decision, based on the relevant Security-Council resolutions and intended to make more flexible the procedures which will enable the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to have recourse to

(Mr. Yañez Barnuevo, Spain)

air strikes in support of UNPROFOR and as a deterrent to the bombardments of the city of Sarajevo, was the appropriate step to take at this point.

(Mr. Yañez Barnuevo, Spain)

The Atlantic Council's decision of 9 February is, in our view, the appropriate response to the request by the United Nations Secretary-General and reflects the firm will of the States members of the Atlantic Alliance to, first, put an end to the siege of Sarajevo, in compliance with Security Council resolutions 824 (1993), 836 (1993) and 844 (1993), thus sparing the civilian population additional suffering; and, secondly, to support the efforts to reach an agreement to demilitarize the city and its environs, preventing any of the parties from obtaining military advantages as a result of the prolongation or lifting of the siege.

The carrying out of air strikes by North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) forces, if needed, would take place in response to a request by the United Nations in the event of further bombardments of Sarajevo, and, in any case, in close coordination with the Secretary-General, if Sarajevo and its environs are not demilitarized as stipulated in the Atlantic Council's decision.

Spain considers that these decisions are based on the relevant Security Council resolutions, in particular resolution 836 (1993) of 4 June 1993, which, may I recall, was adopted as the result of the initiative contained in the Washington Declaration signed by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the United States, the Russian Federation, France, the United Kingdom and Spain. We also consider that those Security Council resolutions give sufficient authority to the United Nations Secretary-General. We have complete confidence that, in close coordination with NATO authorities, he will take whatever decisions are necessary in the circumstances, within the context of those resolutions.

(Mr. Yañez Barnuevo, Spain)

It therefore seems to us wise of the Secretary-General, in accordance with the contents of his letter of 10 February addressed to the President of the Security Council, to have given instructions to his Special Representative for the former Yugoslavia, Mr. Akashi, and through him to the UNPROFOR Commander, to complete, in coordination with his NATO counterparts, the procedures required to begin and execute the air strikes that may be deemed to have become necessary.

It is clear that to achieve these objectives it is crucial that NATO guarantee the security of the personnel of UNPROFOR, of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and of the other international agencies that are working together in the field in a mission of peace, a humanitarian mission. We therefore deem it appropriate for the Secretary-General to have delegated to his Special Representative the authority needed to approve any request which may be made in that respect by the UNPROFOR Commander, a delegation of authority which extends to operations of immediate air support in defence of United Nations personnel in any area of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In any event, we hope that it will not be necessary to have recourse to aerial force and that the leaders of the parties to the conflict will prove to have the necessary good judgement to cooperate with UNPROFOR to arrive at the appropriate arrangements in regard to Sarajevo, by means of an agreement to be negotiated and implemented in the immediate future. We are therefore also very pleased that the Secretary-General has given instructions to Mr. Akashi and to the UNPROFOR military authorities to proceed with and intensify their efforts in that direction, which are beginning to bear fruit.

(Mr. Yañez Barnuevo, Spain)

Furthermore, we must emphasize that the decision of the Atlantic Council must fall clearly within the logic of peace and not within the logic of war. Indeed, the Atlantic Alliance has expressly reiterated support for a negotiated settlement of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina acceptable to all parties, and has praised the European Union's Plan of Action, aimed at reaching a negotiated settlement.

Therefore, a possible limited recourse to force by the international community is not to be interpreted at all as an abandonment of the quest for a political settlement of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The main objective of the decisions adopted by the United Nations and the Atlantic Alliance is to halt the bombardment of Sarajevo and lift the siege to which the city has been subjected, and at the same time carry forward the negotiating process. Nobody should be mistaken about this: it is not a question of the international community's being a party to the conflict but, rather, of protecting civilians and making every possible move towards a negotiated settlement.

Spain has repeatedly stated that the crisis in the former Yugoslavia has no military solution; indeed, it is difficult to imagine any military solution which would be both feasible and acceptable to the international community.

The negotiations among the parties, with the assistance and encouragement of the international community, continue to be the only possible way out. We have therefore consistently supported the efforts made within the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, and in particular the efforts of its Co-Chairmen, Lord Owen and Mr. Stoltenberg. The European Union's Action Plan of

(Mr. Yañez Barnuevo, Spain)

November 1993 falls within this framework, and although it obviously can be improved upon it constitutes the basis on which work is now being done, and it offers the best prospects for a negotiated settlement. In this context and in the present circumstances, priority should be given to lifting the siege of Sarajevo as well as to the steps by the Co-Chairmen designed to place the administration of the city under the temporary authority of the United Nations as a key means to reach a comprehensive agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Indeed, it is not enough to save Sarajevo, or what remains of that city. Sarajevo cannot be kept as an island within a sea of endless fighting. We have to take into account the other "safe areas": Srebrenica and Zepa, Goradze, Tuzla, Bihac. Nor can we forget all the people - the Bosnians of various groupings, Muslims, Serbs, Croats and others - who are still suffering from the effects of the war in places such as Brkco, Olovo, Vitez or Mostar.

Therefore, an agreement on Sarajevo must quickly be followed by a renewed impetus to achieve an effective cease-fire and a peace agreement for all of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

If a negotiated, viable and lasting settlement is to be reached, all the parties must make concessions, even though logically those who started the conflict and have up to now obtained major advantages in the field should yield more.

The parties to the conflict and the international community must not cease their efforts to reach peace. Indeed, they must redouble them. To give the necessary impetus, there must be coordinated action by international organizations - primarily the United Nations and the Atlantic Alliance - and the more active

(Mr. Yañez Barnuevo, Spain)

presence and participation of those countries and groups of countries that can exercise a beneficial influence on the parties to the conflict. Specifically, we call for joint action by the European Union, the United States and the Russian Federation, while not overlooking the contribution which can be made by the neighbouring countries and others, such as those that belong to the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

Spain once again expresses its support for the work of the Co-Chairmen of the Conference, Lord Owen and Mr. Stoltenberg, and for their availability to help in seeking a negotiated and viable solution to the conflict so as to contribute as much as they can to the implementation of the peace agreements which will finally be reached by the parties - for it is the parties which are primarily responsible for reaching such agreements.

At the beginning of April 1992, the bombarding of Sarajevo started and, with it, the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Let us all do everything that is needed so that, as soon as possible, that cruel bombardment will cease, marking the beginning of the end of a war which should not have a second anniversary.

Mr. SARDENBERG (Brazil): As the Security Council meets today to discuss the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, it is difficult not to express a clear sense of frustration and impatience, sorrow and indignation.

For almost two years the Council has been seized of the murderous conflict that rages in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Dozens of resolutions have been adopted, innumerable presidential statements issued, serious diplomatic endeavours undertaken, various international conferences and meetings convened and countless agreements signed, many just to be immediately broken. All that has been to little avail.

The Bosnian war has gone from the headlines to the back pages of the international press, and back, but a solution continues to elude those sincerely striving to reach peace. Despite all the efforts put together by the international community, the critical work of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), the tireless dedication of the mediators of the United Nations and the European Union and the formidable accomplishments of the humanitarian agencies in delivering badly needed relief assistance, innocent civilians continue to fall victim to bullets and artillery shells in Sarajevo and other areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

This meeting is being held under the impact of the bloody attack of 5 February against the central market in Sarajevo. The powerful and distressing images of that vile onslaught are still fresh in everyone's mind. The Brazilian Government and people were appalled and outraged by that horrendous criminal act, for which there can be no possible justification.

Nevertheless, no matter how trying the circumstances - and, indeed, very trying they are - it is essential that the

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

international community not lose sight of what must remain its ultimate goal: putting an end to this painful conflict through the achievement of a just and sustainable peace, acceptable to all the parties.

Brazil has always stressed the need for a negotiated, freely arrived at solution to the conflict and will continue to do so. Any such solution should take into account the legitimate interests of all parties and ensure the protection of the basic rights of all people in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The logic of peace, as some have put it, must prevail over the reasoning of war. The final key to any solution is to be found in diplomacy and direct negotiations in good faith between the three warring parties, not guns.

In this connection, the most recent peace initiative of the European Union has much merit and, in our view, provides a sound basis for a fair resolution of the conflict. It deserves to be explored to the fullest.

The time has come, though, for the international community to make it clear that, in addition to persevering on the diplomatic path, it has the resolve to carry out its own previous decisions aimed at curbing the fighting and supporting UNPROFOR in the performance of its broad mandate.

My delegation welcomes the current close coordination between the Secretary-General and his North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) counterpart with a view to fostering the implementation of relevant Security Council resolutions, in accordance with resolution 836 (1993).

The security of UNPROFOR personnel continues to be a matter of serious concern. It is our understanding that in any circumstances

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

all the appropriate measures will be taken to ensure their safety, as well as that of relief workers.

We are entering a new and crucial phase in the quest for a settlement in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Important initiatives and proposals are now on the table for discussion, including the demilitarization of Sarajevo. The fact that there are considerable risks involved cannot be denied, but neither can the realization that conditions now exist for attaining a lasting peace.

Previous opportunities were, unfortunately, lost after being rejected by one party or another. Now it is high time the parties seized this chance, ceased immediately all hostilities and accepted peace. There must be no doubt that the attitude of each party will be decisive as the international community considers what steps will be taken next. Ultimately, it will be up to the parties to agree on the best way to settle their differences or, otherwise, to make the choice between peace and the continuation of war.

Before concluding, I should like to place on record my delegation's appreciation for the fact that the Council is holding an open debate on this excruciating but very important issue. As part of the efforts to ensure transparency and openness in the deliberations of the Council, Brazil sees it as absolutely essential that the membership at large, and especially those countries with a direct interest in any given matter, be provided with the opportunity to voice their views so that the Council may take them fully into account in carrying out its duties under the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. KHAN (Pakistan): The Government and the people of Pakistan have been deeply shocked, anguished and outraged at the barbaric mortar attack by the Serbs on the central market in Sarajevo on 5 February, which caused the death of 68 Bosnian civilians and critically injured hundreds of innocent men, women and children. We deplore and condemn this attack in the strongest possible terms.

This horrendous incident took place only a day after a similar attack on the suburb of Dobrinja, in which 10 people were killed and 26 wounded. It was part of a series of genocidal and cowardly acts on the part of the Serbs, who have continued to defy, with contempt, the resolutions of this Council, especially those concerning "safe areas". This latest indiscriminate shelling of Sarajevo confirms our worst fears that the inhabitants of Sarajevo and other "safe areas" are left at the mercy of the ruthless Serbian aggressors.

The Government and the people of Pakistan express their heartfelt condolences and sympathy to the Government and the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina and to the bereaved families.

Pakistan has consistently urged the international community to act decisively in order to halt and reverse aggression against the Bosnian Government. We have advocated resolute action, including the use of force, particularly air strikes, to enforce and implement the mandatory decisions of the Council. Regrettably, despite the fact that most of the Security Council resolutions on Bosnia and Herzegovina were adopted under Chapter VII, they remain by and large unimplemented.

To my delegation it is clear that only decisive use of force, particularly the use of surgical, punitive air strikes, will make

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

the Serbs conform to Security Council resolutions. In this context, the requisite legal framework already exists in relevant Security Council resolutions, particularly in the unambiguous stipulations of resolution 836 (1993). A major moral, political and legal responsibility rests on those Powers that have the necessary means to enforce the relevant Security Council resolutions.

We welcome the decision taken by the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Council on 9 February, giving an ultimatum to the Serbs to lift the siege of Sarajevo and to remove their heavy weaponry from the Sarajevo exclusion zone or face punitive air strikes. We commend the decision taken by the Bosnian Government to voluntarily place its weaponry under United Nations control. NATO member States have a great responsibility to fulfil the demands of justice and equity. They must ensure that all provisions of the NATO ultimatum and relevant Security Council resolutions concerning "safe areas" are met by the Serbian side. We express the hope that, unlike previous threats, this decision will be fully and expeditiously implemented. We also hope that the small window of opportunity that has appeared for an honourable peace in Bosnia will not be dissipated and that fundamental United Nations principles will be upheld in finding a lasting and a peaceful solution for Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

For too long Serbian forces have prevented the United Nations Protection Force from opening Tuzla airport for humanitarian operations. Bihac is also reported to have been under Serbian attack for the last few days. The international community must also pay equal attention to the security of the civilian population in all safe areas and in other threatened towns and cities in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

My Prime Minister, Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto, accompanied by her Turkish counterpart, Madame Tansu Ciller, paid a visit to Sarajevo on 2 February. Through their personal commitment to the courage and fortitude of the Government and people of Bosnia, they called upon the international community to preserve the sovereignty, unity, territorial integrity and political independence of Bosnia and to reverse the consequences of ethnic cleansing.

Aggression acquiesced to is aggression legitimized. Those of us who fail to fulfil the responsibility to halt and reverse aggression against Bosnia will be judged by history as accomplices of the Serbian aggressors.

We reiterate that the arms embargo against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is selective, and contrary to Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. It has prevented the victim of aggression from exercising its legitimate right of self-defence. In fact, it has perpetuated the gross military imbalance favouring the Serbs, thus emboldening them to pursue their aggression with impunity. In this context, it is pertinent to refer to relevant General Assembly resolutions, particularly resolution 48/88 of 20 December 1993 urging the Security Council to give all due consideration, on an urgent basis, to exempting the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina from the arms embargo imposed on the former

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

Yugoslavia under Security Council resolution 713 (1991), of 25 September 1991.

The need to allow the Bosnian Government to defend itself has become all the more urgent given recent reports of the presence of regular troops of the Serbian and Croatian armies in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Serbia and Montenegro and the Republic of Croatia have also been violating the arms embargo by supplying arms and equipment to their surrogates in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We are awaiting with keen interest the report by the Secretary-General, requested recently by the Security Council, regarding the full withdrawal of Croatian army elements and their military equipment from Bosnia and Herzegovina. If the Croats fail to comply with the demand of the Security Council, stringent economic sanctions should immediately be imposed on Croatia.

There is also an urgent need to focus on the provision of adequate funding for United Nations peace-keeping operations in Bosnia and elsewhere in the world. We believe that the issue of adequate funding for peace-keeping operations must be addressed urgently, as they are expected to increased in magnitude in the years ahead.

We hope that the International Tribunal will soon begin trials of those responsible for heinous crimes in the former Yugoslavia. We call upon States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to provide generous resources for the Tribunal. The Prime Minister of Pakistan recently pledged a $1 million contribution to the Tribunal's expenses as a manifestation of Pakistan's faith in the United Nations and its commitment to the cause of justice in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

We also express the hope that the Commission of Experts will be allowed to facilitate the work of the International Tribunal by, inter alia, establishing a record of violations.

The Government of Pakistan fully supports the principled position taken by the Bosnian Government and the constructive and flexible attitude it has demonstrated in the peace negotiations. We regret the fact that the Bosnian Government has come under tremendous diplomatic and military pressure to accept the partitioning of its sovereign country. We renew our appeal to all parties to maintain, in good faith, a total cease-fire and a complete cessation of hostilities throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina in order to create an atmosphere conducive to meaningful peace negotiations.

In this context, we should like to recall the Declaration adopted by the Ministerial Meeting of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) Contact Group on Bosnia and Herzegovina, held in Geneva on 17 January 1994, which stressed that, if the peace process is to have any success and legitimacy, it must ensure the independence, territorial integrity, sovereignty and unity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and a geographically and economically viable, and defensible, territory for the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Moreover, the Serbs must be compelled to return all lands seized by the use of force and "ethnic cleansing"; the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina must retain its sovereign access to the Sava river and the Adriatic sea; Sarajevo must remain the undivided capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as a symbol of unity, tolerance and integration; the return of refugees and displaced persons to their homes must be ensured; and there must be

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

international guarantees for the implementation of a peace agreement and guarantees of future security.

My delegation shares the view that the venue of the peace negotiations should be shifted to New York in order to bring them under the direct supervision of the Security Council. All peace proposals must conform to the principles contained in the relevant Security Council resolutions. We must not encourage the dominance of "realities on the ground" over legitimacy.

The tragedy of Bosnia and Herzegovina is a cause of concern to the entire international community. Restoration of peace in this beleaguered country is a collective obligation. The extent of death and destruction at the hands of aggressive forces in Bosnia makes it the most compelling case for united, global action.

How we respond to this challenge will determine the moral content of the future world order. The international community must ensure that the time-honoured principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter triumph over expediency in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. VORONTSOV (Russian Federation) (interpretation from Russian): The proposal to convene an immediate meeting of the Security Council to consider practical ways to demilitarize Sarajevo and introduce United Nations control was put forward by the Russian Federation, in view of the need for the international community to take the most decisive action to put a stop to the escalating violence in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We believe that a genuine partnership between the members of the international community will indeed emerge, in the name of a lasting peace, in open discussion of the problem.

(Mr. Vorontsov, Russian Federation)

Russia, like the international community as a whole, is extremely disturbed by the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina and by the obstacles standing in the way of a settlement to this bloody conflict. The recent barbaric shellings of Sarajevo, which have cost the lives of scores of people, have aroused great indignation in Russia, and we believe that the perpetrators, whoever they may be, must be severely punished. We look forward to the report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on the results of the investigation into these tragic events.

In the present circumstances, we believe that it is extremely important to concentrate our efforts on preventing further bloodshed, to refrain from any action that might fan the flames of war, and, at last, make the breakthrough to a settlement to the conflict, guided first and foremost by the logic of peace.

We note with satisfaction the agreement between the Bosnian Serbs and the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina achieved under the guidance of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), on a cease-fire and on action towards ensuring that all sides - both Serb and Muslim - immediately either put their heavy weapons in the Sarajevo area under UNPROFOR control or withdraw them from the area.

This approach is close to our own position. Russia has more than once proposed the immediate demilitarization of Sarajevo, which would then be placed under United Nations control.

(Mr. Vorontsov, Russian Federation)

We believe that such steps would constitute major progress towards settling the entire Bosnian conflict.

Three weeks ago the Russian Federation put forward the additional initiative of calling on the Security Council to consider adopting further measures to consolidate the safe areas in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Unfortunately, it took the market-place tragedy in Sarajevo for the Security Council and the United Nations forces to become more actively involved in settling this problem.

In his 11 February letter to the President of the Security Council the Secretary-General stated that he was instructing his Special Representative for the former Yugoslavia, Mr. Yasushi Akashi, to finalize detailed procedures for the initiation and conduct of air strikes, and to ensure that those procedures took adequately into account the Secretary-General's responsibilities vis-à-vis the Security Council, in accordance with previously adopted resolutions of the Council.

There can be progress towards a settlement only if neither party secures any advantage while the United Nations forces are carrying out their demilitarization procedures.

As past cease-fires and other agreements between the parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina have often broken down, it is clearly of great importance that the Security Council back up its demands with a strong decision supporting the Secretary-General's letters dated 6 and 11 February; encouraging positive progress in Sarajevo; and supporting the Secretary-General's proposal with respect to the prompt conclusion, with UNPROFOR mediation, of an agreement on an effective cease-fire in and around Sarajevo, on the withdrawal or regrouping and placing under UNPROFOR control of heavy weapons belonging to the Bosnian Serbs and on the placing under UNPROFOR

(Mr. Vorontsov, Russian Federation)

control of heavy weapons belonging to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina in that district, and on ensuring strict compliance with the security regime in the Sarajevo area, including protection for UNPROFOR personnel and halting all violations of that regime, in accordance with Security Council decisions.

In addition to these steps to untie the Sarajevo knot, we believe it essential constantly to state explicitly our support for the process of negotiations towards an overall settlement of the Bosnian conflict. It is now very important to urge all three parties to the conflict to reach a compromise.

For its part, the Russian Federation will continue to cooperate with the European Union and the United States of America in an attempt to find a peaceful settlement.

We are not overdramatizing the present complex and confusing situation with respect to international efforts to settle the crisis. Now under way is the difficult process of agreeing on a consensus approach by the international community and of coordinating action between the United Nations and regional organizations. All of this involves tremendous responsibilities. More than ever before, we need cooperation and the maximum convergence of positions in order to press on with the process of a political settlement in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. KEATING (New Zealand): New Zealand welcomes this opportunity for the members of the Security Council, supported by the wider membership of the United Nations, to send an unmistakable message today to the Bosnian Serbs and to their backers in Belgrade. My delegation was amongst the first to support the request by the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to convene this meeting. We supported his request not only because of the

(Mr. Keating, New Zealand)

tragic events of Saturday, 5 February, in Sarajevo, but because we believe that too much of the Security Council's discussion - of this and other important issues - is held in private.

As I have said, this debate gives the United Nations the opportunity to send a very clear message. What is that message? It is that we, the United Nations, have crossed the Rubicon on this issue. There is no turning back. If the strangulation of Sarajevo does not cease, if the heavy weapons are not withdrawn or placed under the control of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), if there are further indiscriminate attacks on civilians, force will be used.

It is now more than six months since resolution 836 (1993) was adopted. New Zealand had advocated the selective use of air power well before the adoption of that resolution. We strongly supported resolution 836 (1993), urging that air power should be authorized - not only to defend UNPROFOR personnel, but also, if necessary, to carry out UNPROFOR's mandate and protect civilian populations.

We were pleased initially with the result. The prospect of the use of air power did, for a time, have a salutary effect. Bombardments and shellings of safe areas diminished, and there were some constructive developments in the peace-negotiating process. However, it is a sad testament to human nature that even during that period there was never a single day in which the fear of attacks did not blight the lives of the people living in the so-called safe areas.

But in the latter months of 1993 it became quite clear that any positive impact of resolution 836 (1993) had dissipated. The noose around Sarajevo was pulled ever tighter. The Serb negotiators became bolder and less conciliatory in the peace

(Mr. Keating, New Zealand)

negotiations. And as the negotiations faltered, a resurgence of conflict saw all parties vying to gain or regain territory. The protagonists began again - wrongly, in our view - to place hope in an eventual solution by military means rather than by negotiation. This situation has led to increasing pressure on the citizens of Sarajevo and the other towns in Bosnia which were declared safe areas by the Council in 1993. In our view, this situation led almost inevitably to the tragedy that struck the market-place of Sarajevo on Saturday, 5 February. Regrettably, and horribly, there was nothing especially distinctive about the shot which caused this tragedy. Whichever individual or unit was responsible, that attack and its awful consequences were part of a pattern of increasing pressure which has encompassed Sarajevo since the siege began.

We believe the time has come to break this dreadful cycle. The ultimatum that has been put down regarding heavy weapons is both necessary and appropriate. The prospect of forceful intervention by the United Nations is what is needed at this time.

(Mr. Keating, New Zealand)

We therefore welcome the fact that the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Member States of NATO have now concluded that the time has come, in terms of resolution 836 (1993), to place air forces in readiness to undertake air strikes.

The initial indications from Sarajevo that the Bosnian Serbs may be willing to move back their heavy weapons and meet the requirements of resolution 836 (1993) are most welcome. But there must be no illusions in the minds of those who command Bosnian Serb units about the serious consequences of delay, obstruction or renewed bombardment. The Security Council insists on a complete and permanent cessation of bombardment and a complete and permanent withdrawal of the offending weapons.

My Government pledges its full support to the Secretary-General in the execution of the mandate he was given by this Council in June 1993. Both the Secretary-General and the Member States whose aircraft may be involved have our support if it should become necessary to take action.

That the United Nations may be obliged to take action of this kind is highly regrettable. New Zealand believes that the use of force should always be an instrument of last resort. New Zealand does not advocate the indiscriminate use of air power. Air strikes must be carefully calculated as part of a calibrated response to aggression. But we will support their use, if they are the only means to protect the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), ensure it can carry out its mandate including to deter attacks against "safe areas" and to deliver relief, and facilitate progress towards a peace settlement.

In this regard, I need to say a few words about the peace negotiating process. The complexity of the situation in Bosnia and

(Mr. Keating, New Zealand)

Herzegovina should not blind us to the simple reality that peace will not come to that tortured country until there is an agreement between the parties that gives them the confidence to stop fighting.

Throughout all the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, New Zealand has supported negotiations under United Nations auspices designed to reach a fair settlement. But we believe that negotiations must take place in an overall environment in which the protagonists - by deeds as well as words - demonstrate a willingness to reasonably accommodate the political, cultural and social interests of the other parties. Negotiations cannot be said to be fair where the civilian population of one party lives in constant fear of random bombardment, deprivation of humanitarian supplies and repeated war crimes in respect of captured persons and property, and even the wanton destruction of places of worship.

In these circumstances it is necessary and appropriate that the United Nations, as the sponsor of the negotiating process, should use the powers approved in resolution 836 (1993), and unfortunately the time has come when they may have to be used. But I stress that the use of this deterrent must be seen as only one element in an overall set of measures designed to reinforce a solution by negotiation rather than a solution by war.

In this regard it is timely that new ideas are also coming forward to reinvigorate the negotiating process. My delegation welcomes, for instance, the efforts being made by the Government of Slovenia to refocus the attention of the international community on the core problems of Bosnia.

But I must disagree with anyone who advocates either directly or indirectly proposals that would deflect the impact of what has

(Mr. Keating, New Zealand)

been done this last week. The international community, with virtual unanimity, has now warned that force will be used if the heavy weapons are not moved back and if bombardment of Sarajevo continues.

Sarajevo can be put under international administration. That is already envisaged in the peace agreements under negotiation. But in our view the future efforts of the Security Council and of the negotiators in Geneva should be directed towards the promotion of a negotiated settlement as a full package and not the à la carte selection of items which suit one party.

I must also record that New Zealand does not agree with those who would advocate allowing a free flow of arms into Bosnia. We do not believe that such a step would enhance prospects for a negotiated settlement. It would only compound the killing and suffering and create further difficulties for UNPROFOR's humanitarian operations.

In conclusion, my delegation believes that the tragedy of Bosnia has overshadowed us for too long. Let us hope that we are now at a turning-point and that the resolve of the United Nations to act robustly in that country will communicate itself to all parties, giving comfort and confidence to the victims, and reason for the aggressors to lay down their weapons.

Mr. GAMBARI (Nigeria): My delegation wishes to associate itself with previous speakers in expressing outrage at and condemnation of the series of attacks against the civilian population in Sarajevo. Nigerian condemns these dastardly attacks, and in particular the massacre of 68 people in Sarajevo market on 5 February 1994, which we regard as totally reprehensible and completely unacceptable. We believe that a turning-point has been

(Mr. Gambari, Nigeria)

reached when the international community must act decisively to ensure an end to these atrocities once and for all. This Council should send a clear and unambiguous signal that there is a limit to its tolerance of these attacks. That threshold has in fact been reached already. It is now time for firm and decisive measures instead of the multiple threats and costly procrastination of the past.

We fully support the idea of having a thorough investigation of the shelling of the crowded market place in Sarajevo, which occurred on 5 February 1994, but the Council should not be prevented from taking decisive measures now, because there is ample evidence of clear responsibility for other and earlier incidents such as those in which 10 people were killed on 4 February and six girls were killed on 22 January this year. The Council should avoid giving the impression that it is only when large casualties are involved that it shows concern.

In this context, we welcome the Secretary-General's letter to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Secretary-General. We fully support the steps he has taken, which we believe are within the scope of the authority vested in him under resolution 836 (1993). We also welcome the decision of the North Atlantic Council and its determination to take all necessary measures, in collaboration with the United Nations, to prevent further deterioration of the situation in Sarajevo.

This is not the first time in this tragic conflict that NATO has threatened to use air strikes to stop the strangulation of Sarajevo. What is new is that the international revulsion following the sad events of 5 February 1994 has propelled the leaders of NATO to act should their latest ultimatum be disregarded

(Mr. Gambari, Nigeria)

by the Serbs. None the less, what we have at present from NATO is the promise of action and not yet the delivery of such action against the perpetrators of great atrocities in Sarajevo. Furthermore, the promise of action to protect Sarajevo addresses only one part of a wider problem - that is, how to protect a whole people from total destruction at the hands of those who appear determined to "ethnically cleanse" them out of Bosnia and Herzegovina. On this wider issue the international community needs to take urgent further action. NATO has the resources and the moral obligation to do its part in the context of regional organizations playing major roles in resolving regional conflicts.

(Mr. Gambari, Nigeria)

Considering the developments in various parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina since the beginning of this year, my delegation feels that, unless the security situation throughout Bosnia improves dramatically and the peace talks resume promptly and lead to early agreements, the time has perhaps come to revisit the issue of lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina for the following reasons.

First, we should remind ourselves that the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is a sovereign and independent country, a Member of the United Nations. None the less, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bosnia have been constantly and clearly violated - a situation which continues to this day.

Secondly, unspeakable atrocities, including "ethnic cleansing", rapes, killings and wanton destruction, are being perpetrated on the country, with the civilian population bearing the brunt of these cruelties.

Thirdly, this very Council has pledged several times to protect Bosnia and for this purpose established "safe areas". But this did not deter further atrocities; instead, the "safe areas" are besieged and bombarded every day. Quite often, the very soldiers and other personnel sent by the United Nations to carry out this Council's mandate are harassed, killed and in other ways prevented from carrying out their legitimate duties, including the delivery of humanitarian aid. Being fully aware of the relative military strengths of the various parties in Bosnia, the Council should allow those who are disadvantaged to exercise their inherent right to self-defence by suspending the arms embargo imposed on them.

(Mr. Gambari, Nigeria)

What we are proposing is not to advance the logic of war, but to establish the linkage between the logic of peace and a logic of justice. For we believe strongly that peace without justice cannot endure. It is in this context that Nigeria firmly believes that the situation in Bosnia cannot be resolved militarily but by negotiations and through a just political settlement. Hence, we strongly support the ongoing peace efforts and believe that they should be intensified. In the search for a political solution, however, a just and lasting peace cannot be achieved by imposing unacceptable conditions on any one party. To achieve peace, the international community must be firm and resolute in defence of universally accepted principles.

Therefore, in summary, my delegation strongly supports the following specific proposals.

First, the steps so far taken by the Secretary-General should be fully endorsed. We believe that resolution 836 (1993) provides him with the necessary authority to call for action without further reference to this Council.

Secondly, the sieges of Sarajevo and of any other designated "safe area" must be lifted immediately and the bombardments must cease forthwith. The issues of complete demilitarization and the future administration of Sarajevo should be the subject of negotiations between the parties under the auspices of the European Union and the United Nations.

Thirdly, the Security Council should reiterate its demands for an immediate cease-fire throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina and the intensification of efforts towards a political settlement. All parties must recognize and accept the basic principles of the inadmissibility of acquisition of territories by force, respect for

(Mr. Gambari, Nigeria)

the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, and the fundamental human rights of all people.

Fourthly, in the absence of peace and security throughout Bosnia, the Council should perhaps reconsider the arms embargo on Bosnia with a view to enabling the country to exercise its inherent right to self-defence.

Finally, it is our view that the sum total of these recommendations for action by the Council would constitute and also advance the logic of peace with justice - the only realistic and humane logic in this tragic conflict.

Mr. CARDENAS (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The gravity of the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina compels the Security Council to consider the situation in that country yet again.

The latest events - the indiscriminate attacks on the civilian population of Sarajevo - have revealed levels of irrationality and cruelty that deserve nothing but our most vigorous and unequivocal condemnation. These attacks are an affront to civilization and demonstrate a total lack of respect for the norms of international humanitarian law which cannot be tolerated.

The militias which are intent on spreading terror among the civilian population of Sarajevo and are responsible for the artillery strikes can only be described as criminal bands. It should once more be reaffirmed that behind these acts of barbarism, which do not differentiate between the civilian population and military objectives, there are persons who should be tried by the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia. The international

(Mr. Cardenas, Argentina)

community has placed its hopes in that Tribunal, established by the Security Council last year. The effect of its functioning will be the complete restoration of justice.

The slaughter of children and innocent residents of Sarajevo, the breakdown of essential services for the civilian population and the organized and systematic paralysis and deviation of the flow of humanitarian aid lead us to ponder the depths of human monstrosity that war can reveal. These atrocities, as well as the acts and consequences of "ethnic cleansing", are not abstract practices but tragedies which affect persons and families, whose sufferings we share.

In the drive for territorial conquests by force and in the name of selfish ideologies that exclude groups and sectors, very serious violations of fundamental human rights - such as the right to life, physical integrity, freedom and property - have been carried out in Bosnia and Herzegovina, violations which the international community can in no way accept. The very real genocide taking place in Bosnia and Herzegovina is a repugnant aberration which must end. The full enjoyment of human rights in that country must be promptly restored.

For that to happen, the first requirement is peace, which the conscience of all mankind demands. The United Nations has always advocated and continues to advocate a solution to the conflict at the negotiating table. So it must be. To this end, the United Nations has mobilized enormous human and material resources through the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), a peace-keeping force which is nobly and generously operating in very high-risk situations. The immense and arduous work in the humanitarian field which our Organization has been doing deserves all our gratitude.

(Mr. Cardenas, Argentina)

We demand, and will continue to demand, that humanitarian aid be permitted to circulate freely, and we repudiate those who, in open violation of international humanitarian law, interrupt, delay or divert the arrival of the respective convoys.

Taking into account the work of the United Nations Protection Force, to which my country is a major contributor of troops, and the presence in Bosnia and Herzegovina of the humanitarian organizations, we cannot, under the present circumstances, go along with certain proposals to re-examine the situation, which might have adverse effects on the functioning of these bodies and on the intensity of the conflict itself.

Security Council resolution 836 (1993) sets forth a framework for action in relation to the "safe areas". In this context, since appeals for peace have failed, the possibility of having recourse to force on behalf of the Organization and with the support of the Charter is - as the Secretary-General points out in paragraph 43 of his document "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111) - essential to preserving the credibility of the United Nations as the guarantor of international security and, moreover, should be understood as an instrument within the logic of peace. The action for collective security is legitimized by the Security Council decisions adopted within the context of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

In this tragic hour, we support the wise and brave decision of the Secretary-General to request the cooperation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. That organization's response of 9 February clearly shows the necessity of cooperation between both institutions in order to face this unique crisis.

Attacks on the civilian population in Sarajevo require firm and adequate action by the international community to put an end to

(Mr. Cardenas, Argentina)

the aggression, the siege of that city and the incredible savagery. Artillery strikes on the capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina should never again take place. All the parties to the conflict should move towards peace in good faith, at the negotiating table.

To this end, we appeal to all of them to exert themselves to the utmost to reach a political settlement. We know that such a settlement will necessarily require all the parties to make concessions which, nevertheless, will not be more onerous than the sacrifices and sufferings of war. The peacefully negotiated solution to this conflict must be realistic and just. Only then can it be permanent.

(Mr. Cardenas, Argentina)

We also support the proposal to place the city of Sarajevo under temporary United Nations administration, and we agree on its demilitarization within the context of a comprehensive solution to the conflict.

The parties must respect the existing cease-fire, place all heavy weapons under the control of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), and proceed accordingly, adjusting their conduct to the logic and the objective of peace.

The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina deserves the same consideration as any other United Nations Member in regard to the full application of the principles of the Charter. Its inhabitants must be able to aspire to live in a pluralistic, integrated and tolerant society. In this forum, Argentina clearly states its rejection of the policy of intolerance and racism. The rights of every minority must be recognized and respected within the framework drafted by this very Organization.

Moreover, Argentina rejects the acquisition of territory through the use of force. Therefore, we pronounce once again ourselves in favour of respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The work of UNPROFOR, we repeat, deserves our greatest appreciation. UNPROFOR is operating under high-risk conditions and in areas where groups dedicated to terror and violence seek to erase the most basic foundations of human society. Let us recall with respect and recognition the soldiers of several nations who have given their lives and been wounded in the difficult task of achieving the purposes and implementing principles of our Organization in the countries of the former Yugoslavia. Let no one

(Mr. Cardenas, Argentina)

lose sight of the concrete results achieved through UNPROFOR's presence in Bosnia and Herzegovina: striving for peace, saving many lives and trying to prevent, or lessen, the terrible sufferings of the civilian population. We continue to warn all parties of the need to respect fully the security of United Nations personnel.

The citizens of our countries are following most attentively the attitude of our Organization to this crisis. There can be no question of a passive attitude to the widespread trampling underfoot of the norms of international humanitarian law. We refer to the ethical basis of United Nations action in this conflict, which began to become clear with resolution 688 (1991) of April 1991. Since then the Council realizes that there may be violations of international humanitarian law which, since they are exceptional, are a threat to international peace and security. In our view, it is not a question of interests. That cannot be so when repeated very grave behaviour offends the conscience of humanity.

Therefore, let us not lose sight of the words of the preamble of our Charter, in which the peoples of the United Nations declare themselves determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, to reaffirm fundamental human rights and to defend the dignity and worth of the human person, the equal rights of nations large and small as well as justice and respect for international law.

It is time for the ideals reflected in these words also to reach the children of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This is our joint commitment.

Mr. AL-KHUSSAIBY (Oman): At the outset, on behalf of the Sultanate of Oman, I wish to convey our heartfelt condolences to the friendly Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and to the bereaved families of those who lost their lives following the last tragic shelling of that Republic by Serb forces.

We join previous speakers in extending to you, Sir, our sincere thanks for giving us this opportunity to address the Council regarding the recent events that have taken place in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Since the establishment of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and its subsequent accession to United Nations membership in May 1992 we have seen that country subjected to continuous armed and military aggression which has targeted its sovereignty and independence and violated its legitimate right to live in peace. During the past two years of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina we have witnessed gross violations in this respect of international and humanitarian law and of basic human values. What we are now witnessing in Bosnia and Herzegovina - the killing of innocent civilians in various areas, the siege of cities, the blocking of humanitarian convoys from delivering their relief supplies to the vulnerable, as well as "ethnic cleansing" and all the other ongoing atrocities - constitutes flagrant defiance of the will of the international community and a total disregard for the resolutions adopted in this connection by the international community.

We are assembled here once again, this time to review the prevailing circumstances in Bosnia in the aftermath of the recent massacre perpetrated by the Serbs against the innocent people of

(Mr. Al-Khussaiby, Oman)

Sarajevo on Saturday, 5 February 1994, which left at least 66 people dead and 159 wounded, the majority of them unarmed civilians. This massacre was committed at a time when the Serbs were pretending to resort to the negotiating table. Such a contradictory position raises serious doubts as to whether the Serbs, as the aggressors, are serious enough and ready to reach a peaceful settlement to this conflict.

My country, while condemning this new Serbian aggression, would call upon the Security Council to take the appropriate and necessary measures to punish the aggressors and to protect the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina, who have resorted to this Organization, seeking its support for their just cause.

Since the eruption of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia and the aggression against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a Member of the United Nations, my country has been calling on the international community to allow this newly emerging Republic to exercise its full right of self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. While efforts have been made by the European Community towards carrying out air strikes against the Serbian forces, which have Sarajevo under siege, we believe that it is high time to restore the balance of power in the area in a manner that will enable the people of Bosnia to defend themselves against any potential future attacks - by lifting the arms embargo on defensive weapons imposed on Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Welcoming the efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the contents of the two letters dated 6 February 1994 from the Secretary-General of the United Nations

(Mr. Al-Khussaiby, Oman)

addressed to you, Sir, in your capacity as President of the Council for this month, and to the Secretary-General of NATO, the delegation of Oman views these steps as recognition of the urgent need to strengthen the defensive capabilities of the Bosnian people.

In this context, we note that if the Serb forces concede or surrender to the ultimatum to them by withdrawing their heavy weapons beyond 20 kilometres from the Sarajevo city centre, there is no guarantee that the same artillery will not be used in the killing of other innocent people in other areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina, undoubtedly confirming what we have pointed out before about the primary need of the Bosnian people for self-defence. That need cannot be met without the lifting of the arms embargo on defensive weapons imposed on Bosnia and Herzegovina, as contained in resolution 713 (1991) on the arms embargo to the former Yugoslavia.

(Mr. Al-Khussaiby, Oman)

The establishment of peace has always been and will remain our main objective in this area, and in the context of my country's endeavour to establish this significant principle we reiterate our demand that the arms embargo imposed on the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina be lifted, for we are quite confident that the people of that country do not seek any aggression against their neighbours, but, on the contrary, seek to live in coexistence with them.

In the light of those factors, we join many third-world countries, the Muslim nations and others in their rightful orientations, which stem from their belief that the sole means of ending this conflict depends upon granting the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina their legitimate right to defend themselves. Such a right cannot be achieved unless the unjustifiable, imposed arms embargo is lifted.

The time has come for the international community to demonstrate, through the Security Council, its credibility by strongly supporting the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the face of this aggression. We therefore look forward to seeing the Council take appropriate measures towards realizing the legitimate right of self-defence of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We reaffirm our full support for this initiative calling for the lifting of the arms embargo imposed on this Republic in order to help its people in ending the suffering and injustices they have endured and to help in bringing about peace and security, for which this young, emerging Republic has been waiting for too long.

Mr. KOVANDA (Czech Republic): The continuing conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina is one in which something called "sporadic fire" has been elevated to normality, in which massacres and "ethnic cleansing" are employed to change, and even create, borders and in which historical, religious and cultural monuments are destroyed as a matter of course. It is a conflict without parallel in post-war Europe.

We find the Serbian party bearing primary responsibility for this conflict. Many of its leaders are fanning the dangerous flames of ethnic disturbances, which feed extreme nationalism on all sides of the conflict, nationalism that is so foreign to everything that Bosnia and Herzegovina used to represent before the war started. This results in a great danger for peace and security far beyond the borders of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We feel, of course, the same indignation as every other speaker has expressed over the 5 February Sarajevo market-place massacre. We note that the guilty party has not been identified yet. Unless and until it is identified, we do not feel it appropriate to apportion blame, however strong our suspicions may be. At any rate, we hope that the culprit will be identified and then dealt with through appropriate legal mechanisms, especially the International Tribunal for Yugoslav war crimes.

Meanwhile, though, there is an important sense in which the identity of the culprit this time around is irrelevant. The massacre of 5 February was just one of a number of atrocious attacks on the city, and the culprit in others has been identified only too clearly as the Serbian side. More people than ever before lost life or limb on that fateful Saturday, but, in our opinion,

(Mr. Kovanda, Czech Republic)

the difference between the death of six people and the death of more than 60 is one of numbers only.

This is an occasion for us to do some soul-searching. We have to ask ourselves why the death of six schoolchildren last month did not have the same effect. Why did the death of 10 people on Friday, a day before the critical Saturday, not have the same effect? If 60 lost lives led us to see the conflict in a different light, would 50 have been enough? Or 40? If 10 lives lost were not enough to shake us up, would 20 have done the trick? We have to address these questions in order to investigate our own sense of humanity in politics, our own reactions to war and the degree to which we have become inured to far-away suffering.

On 9 February a cease-fire was agreed between the Bosnian Serbs and the Government forces. We welcome this step, of course. Still, we bear in mind the dozens of cease-fires agreed to previously, only to be honoured in their breach. We hope for the best in this latest cease-fire and are encouraged that, so far, it has been more or less holding. We hope that it proves to be durable enough to overcome the cynicism we have developed over the past months and years about the capacity of the parties to honour their own commitments.

We welcome with relief the visible and unequivocal readiness of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to put muscle behind the demands of the international community. We applaud in this regard NATO's response to the request of the United Nations Secretary-General to authorize air strikes against heavy-weapons positions responsible for attacks against civilians. The 10-day deadline is long enough to be met, but too short for any of the

(Mr. Kovanda, Czech Republic)

parties to squabble and seek a change in conditions. The latest reported conditions put forward by Bosnian Serbs indicate to us that they perhaps continue to prefer the military option, and this is unacceptable.

Let me also mention in this context that we have never doubted that the Secretary-General has since last summer had all the necessary authority to invoke the use of air power, concerning both close air support and air strikes, as far as the Security Council is concerned.

The threat of air strikes cannot be seen in isolation. It is a part of a broader set of measures and does not, in and of itself, amount to a solution. Any solution has to come from the three sides in the conflict. The threat has been issued, in particular, to prevent the strangulation of Sarajevo, which in turn will make it possible to place the city under United Nations administration, should that be the desire of the parties. The new air-strike situation will, however, help concentrate their minds on seeking a solution.

The fact that NATO has demanded more seriously than ever certain behaviour on the part of the combatants should drive home the point that the combatants themselves are, in the final analysis, responsible for reaching a settlement. That this did not happen in the latest round of the Geneva negotiations is not altogether surprising; the NATO measures significantly changed the situation, and this change has first to be grasped, assimilated and analysed by all the participants in Geneva. We believe that the acute possibility of air strikes will eventually contribute to real progress.

(Mr. Kovanda, Czech Republic)

This conflict will not allow any party to emerge as an all-round, permanent victor. It would only compound the tragedy if parties to the conflict did not grasp this fact, if they failed to recognize that the option of peace is the only one available and if the Saturday massacre ended up being just another episode in accomplishing the self-serving but unattainable goals of military adventurers.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker for this morning. A number of names remain on my list of speakers. In view of the lateness of the hour, I intend, with the concurrence of the Council, to suspend the meeting now.

The meeting was suspended at 1.10 p.m.